DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 566 FL 014 427

AUTHOR McGroarty, Mary
TITLE Design and Evaluation of Cross-Cultural Workshops for ESL Teachers and Administrators.
PUB DATE May 84
NOTE 41p.; Based on a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (18th, Houston, TX, March 6-11, 1984).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; *Cross Cultural Training; *English (Second Language); Graduate Students; Inservice Teacher Education; Language Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; *Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Education; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

Two cross-cultural workshops are outlined and discussed, one designed for graduate students in a training program for teachers of English as a second language and one for public school teachers and administrators. Activities used in each workshop and the rationale for their selection are described in detail. Each workshop included a combination of cognitive, experiential, and affective approaches to cross-cultural topics related to the professional roles of the participants. Evaluation of the workshops was carried out by means of a rating scale and an open-ended questionnaire. The rating scale was a 10-item instrument devised for the goals and content of each workshop and was administered immediately before and after workshop sessions. The questionnaire was distributed after each workshop. The self-rating scale allowed assessment of the effectiveness of the sessions by relating gains in the participants' self-rated awareness of cultural issues to the specific activities chosen for the workshops. To varying degrees, both workshops were perceived as useful by participants, with questionnaire comments corroborating rating scale information. Participants in both workshops made significant gains in self-rated cultural knowledge. Further research into the long-term value of such training in helping educators become more effective in cross-cultural settings at home and abroad is recommended. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245566

Design and Evaluation of Cross-Cultural Workshops for ESL Teachers and Administrators

Mary McGroarty
Assistant Professor
TESL/Applied Linguistics Programs
University of California, Los Angeles

May 1984

(Paper presented at the 18th Annual TESOL Convention, Houston, Texas, March 10, 1984)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARY McGROARTY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL014427

Design and Evaluation of Cross-Cultural Training Workshops
for ESL Teachers and Administrators

Abstract

This paper discusses two cross-cultural workshops, one (the TESL Workshop) designed for graduate students in a TESL training program, the other (the School Workshop) planned for teachers and administrators in a school district. Activities used in each workshop and the rationale for their selection are described in detail. Each workshop included a combination of cognitive, experiential, and affective approaches to cross-cultural topics related to the professional roles of the participants. Evaluation of the workshops was carried out by means of a rating scale and an open-ended questionnaire. The rating scale was a short (10-item) instrument devised to suit the goals and content of each workshop; it was administered immediately before and after workshop sessions. The questionnaire was distributed after each workshop. While psychometrically unsophisticated, the self-rating scale allowed the workshop planners to assess the effectiveness of the sessions by relating gains in participants' self-rated awareness of cultural issues to the specific activities chosen for the workshops. To varying degrees, both workshops were perceived as useful by the participants; their comments generally corroborated the information from the rating scale. Pre- and post-workshop ratings, analyzed by means of t-tests, revealed that participants in both workshops made significant gains in self-rated cultural knowledge. Thus both workshops were valuable for participants. Still unanswered, however, is the question of the long-term worth of such training in helping educators to become more effective in cross-cultural settings in the U.S. or abroad. In this connection, some additional methods for evaluating cross-cultural training are suggested.

Design and Evaluation of Cross-Cultural Workshops for ESL Teachers and Administrators

Introduction

In recent years, those concerned with second language teaching and learning have argued for the importance of the cultural dimension of language learning. It has been proposed that intercultural communication skills are essential for English as a second language (ESL) teachers (McGroarty and Galvan, in press) and for teachers at all levels who function in intercultural settings, whether in a bilingual education program in the U.S. (Albert and Triandis, 1979) or abroad (Klassen, 1981). Foreign language educators also have called for increased emphasis on the interplay between culture and language, both as a goal of teacher preparation (Muyskens, 1984) and as a means of providing effective instruction (Crawford-Lange and Lange, 1984, Robinson, 1981). Along with the growing emphasis on the cultural dimension of language learning and teaching has come a growing interest in the possible contributions of the field of cross-cultural communication (Condon and Yousef, 1975) to second language education.

Cross-cultural training is critical for ESL teachers. They often teach in non-English-speaking countries. Even if employed in an English-speaking setting, they instruct students who are from many different countries and are also often new to an English-speaking world; thus the ESL teacher becomes a broker between the students and a sometimes alien institution (Dunnett, Dubin, and Lezberg, 1981). Both situations demand cross-cultural sensitivity on the part of the teacher.

Despite the centrality of cultural issues to the role of the ESL teacher, few teacher training programs include a course in intercultural communication (Black, 1978). If ESL teachers are sent abroad by large organizations such as the Peace Corps, they may receive some systematic preparation in cross-cultural issues (Brislin, 1979). However, many who go abroad and most who remain in the country where they have been educated must depend on short courses or workshops to develop their intercultural skills. The workshop format, long the most prevalent form of in-service education (Nicholson, Joyce, Parker, and Waterman, 1976), offers participants the opportunity to increase their knowledge of a selected area in a relatively short period of time. It has been used to train such groups as foreign teaching assistants who will work in U.S. universities (Sadow and Maxwell, 1983), teachers who wish to improve their spoken proficiency in a second language (Cumming, 1984), and students about to study abroad (Grove, 1982). ESL teachers have also used the workshop format specifically to increase intercultural awareness (English, 1981).

In this paper I discuss two different cross-cultural workshops carried out with ESL teachers and educators. One workshop took place on a university campus in conjunction with a course on intercultural communication and the teaching of ESL; the other workshop took place at a school district serving a large proportion of language minority students, many of them recent immigrants. My purpose is twofold: to describe the methods used in designing each workshop and to report on the evaluation system used to assess the effectiveness of the workshops. Second-language educators can thus determine which methods and evaluation systems would be useful for their own cross-cultural training endeavors.[1]

Methods for Workshop Design

Several possible methods are available to those wishing to conduct cross-cultural training. Trainers may choose experiential methods, which emphasize learning from first-hand participation in tasks selected to represent aspects of cross-cultural experience (Batchelder and Warner, 1977); cognitive methods, which provide participants with factual information about their own culture or the culture they are about to enter (Hoopes and Ventura, 1979); affective methods, which attempt to engage the participants' emotions in order to facilitate learning (Furuto and Furuto, 1983); or any combination of these. In the workshops described here, different combinations of these types of training activities were chosen according to the nature of the groups participating and the goals of each workshop.

Those participating in the university workshop (here called the TESL Workshop because of its connection with the course on intercultural communication and the teaching of ESL) numbered 29, almost evenly divided between American (14) and international (15) personnel. The international participants comprised groups of students from China (7), Korea (2), and Africa (2), and individuals from Italy, Brazil, Japan, and New Zealand. Nearly all 24 out of 29) were graduate students or visiting scholars, with 10 enrolled in the course on intercultural communication and ESL. In addition to the 29 participants, there were 3 leaders and 3 facilitators for the activities. These six individuals were staff members or experienced volunteers associated with the International Students Office at UCLA (4 people); the director of a similar office at another local university; and the instructor of the intercultural communication and ESL course. Of the entire group of 35 persons taking part in the TESL workshop, all but two had had significant international experience (defined as at least six

months outside one's native culture). Almost two thirds of the participants (19 our of 29) were professionally concerned with the teaching of English, either in the US or abroad. There were 16 men and 13 women. The workshop was organized as a part of the graduate course on intercultural communication and TESL in order to give those taking the course an opportunity for cross-cultural learning related to their specialty, the teaching of English. The purpose of this workshop was thus to enhance participants' awareness of the cultural influences on language learning and teaching because most of them were second language teachers. The focus was specifically on communication in the second language classroom.

The group taking part in the school district workshop was more homogeneous. All participants except one were American; thirteen of the 16 participants were women. Half of the participants (8 out of 16) worked directly with language minority or immigrant students as a regular part of their assigned duties; 5 occasionally did so, and 3 did not usually do so. Ten participants were administrators, either at the district or the school site level; six were teachers; usually resourse teachers, ESL, or bilingual specialists.

This was thus a group of middle-and high-ranking professionals in the district; they averaged at least ten years' experience in education, and several had spent much more time, fifteen to thirty years, in the field. While most had not spent long periods of time in other cultures, many had traveled extensively within the U.S. and sometimes overseas as well. The workshop was organized at the request of the district's multicultural affairs office and led by two instructors from a local university. The main goal of this workshop was to increase participants' awareness of cultural factors affecting all aspects of education, not only the learning and teaching of language. Because these educators dealt with a wide

variety of students concerns, the workshop was to be a general treatment of cultural issues and their impact on educational practice.

The two workshops were designed with the participants' background, interests, and professional responsibilities in mind. For the TESL workshop, activities were chosen to complement the material covered in the course many of the students were taking, provide the chance for American and international students to interact, and address issues of language learning and teaching in the U.S. and abroad. For the school personnel workshop, activities were selected to highlight general cross-cultural issues, allow the participants to share their considerable experience related to intercultural issues in American schools, and provide exposure to resources which might be useful to the educators at their own schools. In the TESL workshop, most of the activities chosen were experiential because the course on intercultural communication and TESL provided considerable theoretical and factual information. For the school personnel, on the other hand, most activities used were of the information-conveying, factual variety for two reasons: first, the participants wanted information to take back to their own situations and adapt for use in assisting other educators with whom they worked. Second, this group consisted almost entirely of members of one culture, that of middle-class Americans, thus making the provision of convincing, first-hand material from other cultures more difficult. The general plan of activities used in each workshop is shown in Figure 1 on the following page.

FIGURE 1

General Plan of Activities for Two Cross-Cultural Workshops

I. Workshop for TESL Trainees (two Saturday mornings, 9 a.m. - 1 p.m., in October)

Day 1	Day 2
1. Get-acquainted exercise	1. Discussion of homework assignment
2. Classroom perception role-play	2. Presentation on communicative competence; emphasis on regulator behaviors
3. Non-verbal communication task	3. Demonstration of regulator behaviors by Americans, Italians, and Chinese
4. Values orientation presentation focus on classroom values	4. Cross-cultural learning: students teach other groups "their" classroom style
5. Homework assignment: observation of a language class; Preston (1981) article distributed	5. Demonstration of "other" classroom styles
	6. Discussion of student and teacher expectations in multicultural classrooms

II. Workshop for School Personnel (two days, 9 a.m. - 3 p.m., in August)

Day 1	Day 2
1. Exercise in making predictions	1. film-"Manwatcher," BBC/Films Inc., 1980
2. Theory X/Theory Y in school settings	2. Discussion of homework assignment
3. Cross-cultural misunderstandings	3. Values; conceptions of "good" teachers
4. film-"Perception", McGraw-Hill, 1979	4. film-"Crosstalk,: BBC/Films Inc., 1979
5. Discussion of perception and judgments	5. Paralinguistic and sociolinguistic cues
6. film-"Los Vendidos," El Teatro Campesino	6. Dealing with misundertanding
7. Homework assignment: consider stereotyping in your community	7. Additional applications; summary

As Figure 1 shows, neither workshop was purely experiential or purely cognitive in the methods used. Both were hybrids, using a variety of activities to meet the goals of each workshop. A more detailed description of each workshop will explain the rationale for choosing the activities used. It is clear that, while each workshop combined different types of activities, the emphasis on the TESL workshop was on experiential learning while emphasis in the school workshop was on cognitive learning. A more detailed description of each workshop will explain the rationale for each activity.

The first day of the TESL workshop began with a standard get-acquainted exercise in which participants were asked to introduce each other to the group (Activity 1). This was done to familiarize the participants with each other and with the reasons each person had for participating. Many individuals expressed their goals in terms of becoming better English teachers in intercultural settings and thus created an element of commonality. The second exercise allowed participants to study non-verbal behavior in a classroom setting; they viewed a short role play in which a professor and a student, both speaking Arabic, discussed a part of the Quoran (Day 1, Activity 2). Few of the participants spoke any Arabic; they were asked to concentrate on non-verbal and paralinguistic cues in this short segment of classroom life and state their reactions to the evidently formal posture of both professor and student, the even tone of voice used, the restrained and infrequent gestures employed, and the manner in which questions were asked and answered. This activity is somewhat analogous to transcultural sensitization (Hernandez, 1984) in which participants are asked to state reactions to object's representative of another culture. In the TESL workshop, we wanted to emphasize experiences in language classrooms and thus used an artificial but still relevant sketch of actual classroom events. To continue the focus on non-verbal communication,

participants were then asked to engage in a simulation exercise varying amount of eye contact and interpersonal distance (Activity 3); the assignment was to discuss time differences across cultures, drawing from personal experience, while pairs of participants stood at approximately five feet, three feet, and then one foot from each other. This exercise was selected to show that similar information (i.e., facts about time differences) is experienced very differently when conveyed within the differing patterns of gaze behavior and interpersonal difference that characterize various cultures. Most Americans reported that, despite the neutrality or intrinsic interest of the information provided by their conversational partner, they felt threatened or embarrassed if the partner was "too close" and puzzled if the partner "wasn't paying attention" (i.e., was not looking directly at the interlocutor). After these experiential activities, some factual information on more abstract values (e.g., norms of respect; reverence for tradition versus innovation) governing classroom behavior was presented to the whole group (Activity 4). Most of this information was based on texts by Condon and Yousef (1975) and Levine and Adelman (1981); it was given to participants to illustrate some additional constraints on classroom behavior which could not easily be illustrated through short role plays. The first session concluded with a homework assignment; in the week that intervened between sessions of the workshop, participants were asked to carry out two activities; to visit an elementary language class taught by a native speaker of the language in question (preferably a language they themselves did not know) in order to pay close attention to the paralinguistic and non-verbal cues used in teaching; and to read an article (Preston, 1981) on matters of individual identity related to second-language learning. The purpose of these activities was to refine observational skills which could be applied to second language

classrooms; make participants aware of the non-linguistic cues used in language teaching; and impart information on some of the ways second language study may interact with a student's cultural identity.

The second day of the TESL workshop began with discussion of the observational assignment (Day 2, Activity 1). Most of the participants noted that attending a class in which they were neither student nor teacher had allowed them time to focus on non-verbal communication systematically. Workshop participants were divided into three smaller groups of approximately seven people each and asked to describe the classes they had visited. Some found the visits to yield a wealth of information in terms of teacher and student deportment; terms of address used by students and teachers; instructors' methods of regulating student participation; use of interpersonal space in the classroom; and general classroom atmosphere. Others found the classroom visits not very useful in illustrating non-linguistic factors related to second language teaching. When the small groups re-convened in large group session, those who had observed classes teaching the same language-- French, Japanese, whatever-- were asked to compare their impressions of the classrooms. In this way, designers of the workshop hoped to generate observations of intracultural variation in teaching styles as well as a broad picture of the body of impressions gathered by the participants.

After comparing classroom observations, participants heard a short lecture on what might be termed unconscious aspects of communicative competence, with special emphasis on the regulator behaviors (Rosenfeld, 1982; Ekman and Friesen, 1969) specific to various cultures (Activity 2). This was followed by a demonstration of regulator behaviors by American, Italian, and Chinese participants. Each cultural group was asked to show how regulator behavior-- clues of posture, gaze, gesture, and timing that

govern the act of speaking-- was used in the classroom to signal when a student had a question, when a teacher wished to recognize a student, what happened if a student gave a wrong answer, and when a lesson had been concluded (Activity 3). Following the demonstration of regulator behaviors, students were again broken into three smaller groups in order to carry out some experiential learning: each group was paired with two native coaches both from a different culture in order to learn the appropriate classroom behavior of that different culture (Day 2, Activity 4). This resulted in a group of Americans being coached on Chinese classroom behavior; a group of American and Asian students being coached on Italian classroom behavior; and a group of Chinese and Korean participants being coached on American classroom behavior. The goal of this exercise was to give participants an opportunity to experience the classroom constraints of other cultures, even artificially. Thus we wished to use role-play, long recognized as a useful technique in promoting second lanugage teaching (Piper and Piper, 1983) and cross-cultural adjustment (Constantinides, 1984; Donahue and Parsons, 1982) as a means for providing participants with a chance to feel what it meant to undertake learning in a culture different from their own. After participants had spent about thirty minutes being coached in their new behaviors, each small group demonstrated the new pattern to the entire group (Activity 5). These demonstrations were accompanied by varying degrees of amusement from those native to the culture in question. The Chinese participants were gratified and amused that the demonstrator group was so decorous in its classroom portrayal; the American participants laughed aloud when the Asian participants portrayed an American classroom in which students negotiated the final exam with the professor, put their feet up on desks, drank coffee and chewed gum in the "class" depicted. Following this demonstration, the whole group discussed issues of culturally-based student and teacher expectations as related to second language

instruction (Activity 6). The goal of this last activity was to raise issues of possibly conflicting expectations and generate a variety of ideas about coping with cultural differences in the language classroom. Our aim was not to have participants feel that they should act like natives whenever they would teach (Robinson, 1978 provides a good discussion of this potential error in language learning, which also applied to language teaching), but to discuss ways of synthesizing one's own expectations as a language teacher and the expectations of students in order to be a more effective instructor. In designing the workshop, we did not want to imply that there was any one way to provide culturally appropriate English language instruction. We simply wished participants to realize that culture affects language instruction in numerous ways, and that different teaching situations-- teaching ESL in a vocational program for Spanish-speaking adults, teaching ESL in bilingual programs serving Korean and Vietnamese children, or teaching EFL in a Chinese university, for example-- would call for different classroom behaviors based in part on the culture of the teacher and the students.

The workshop for school personnel was mainly cognitive in the methods chosen. We chose cognitive methods because the group was fairly homogeneous, thus making it difficult to elicit numerous native experiences of another culture. While experiential training activities can be used with any kind of group, we wished to draw from participants' personal cross-cultural experiences in setting up role-plays and other simulation activities. The equal numbers of American and international participants in the TESL workshop made this procedure feasible there, but doing so was thus not similarly possible in the school workshop.

The school personnel workshop began with an exercise in making predictions (Day 1, Activity 1). Participants were asked to predict types of

information such as age, college major, and types of television programs preferred for the two workshop leaders. The prediction exercise was chosen to illustrate that appearance and status often provide information for both accurate and inaccurate judgments about people. Leaders used themselves as examples because workshop participants having worked together for years, already knew each other very well. Following this short exercise, participants heard an extended presentation about two theories of management, Theory X and Theory Y (KOontz and O'Donnell, 1978; McGregor, 1960) applied to school settings (Activity 2). This theory distinguishes two types of managers, one more authoritarian (Theory X) and one more permissive (Theory Y). Because many participants were administrators, we wished them to consider their own management style in relation to these two theoretical types. By posing some intercultural problems for them and asking how Theory X and Theory Y school administrators would respond, we tried to generate a variety of possibilities for effective intercultural management in school settings. Then, to move the discussion from consideration of idealized types of managers to actual school situations, we used a series of ten cross-cultural vignettes developed especially for this workshop (Activity 3). Based on the critical icidents workshop described by English (1981), the examples of actual cross-cultural problems that had occured in this district were helpful in allowing participants to describe their responses to the issues raised. (Examples of the some of the incidents and a list of films and videotapes used appear in the Appendix of this article.) To show that judgments shape basic perceptions of any event, the film "Perception" (McGraw-Hill, 1979), which describes an industrial accident from the perspective of two workers involved, the supervisor, and a bystander, was shown (Activity 4). Participants then discussed the role of judgments and expectations in shaping perceptions, with special reference to the school-related incidents distributed previously.

After a lunch break, participants saw another film, "Los Vendidos" ('the ones who have sold out') (El Teatro Campesino, 1972) a melodramatic illustration of ways some different types of Mexican-Americans have adjusted to the stereotypical expectations of members of the majority culture. Our goal here was to show that, as members of majority and minority groups become more caught up in stereotypical conceptions of each other, they lose the ability to perceive individual differences and make accurate judgments about behavior. As a homework assignment, participants were asked to consider the stereotypes of the groups in their own community. We asked them to determine how these stereotypes had arisen, whether they correspond to any actions of the group members, and whether they masked any individual or within-group differences that were important in an educational setting (Day 1, Activity 7).

The second session of the school workshop was held the following day. Participants first viewed the videotape "Manwatcher" (British Broadcasting Corporation/Films Inc., 1980) a lively treatment of non-verbal communication, used to put the participants at ease prior to the discussion of the homework assignment, which dealt with sensitive issues. We then discussed the homework assignment (Day 2, Activity 2). Participants noted that some stereotypes were based on one or two dramatic incidents (such as a grudge between two families within one ethnic group, which was later played out in a fight on school grounds) which lived in the community memory, while others were based on repeated patterns of behavior (such as students who were apparently not interested in extracurricular or athletic activities) which the educators had noticed for a long period of time. These teachers and principals said they knew some students from different language minority groups who did not fit the group stereotypes identified. Furthermore, they noted that many community members who held stereotypical notions

about members of linguistic minority groups had no direct experience in school settings with members of these groups. Our goal in this discussion was to illustrate for participants that their positions allowed them to interact with students from language minority groups in several ways that could yield accurate rather than stereotypical understanding of reasons for possible conflict in school. We wanted them to pay attention to the variety of information to which they had access and suggest ways to use it in carrying out their educational responsibilities. We then continued the discussion of possible cultural conflicts in educational settings on a more abstract level by presenting material on cultural value patterns (Day 2, Activity 3). Based on the Condon and Yousef (1975) and Levine and Adelman (1981) information we had used in the TESL workshop, this information was used to set up a framework for a more specific presentation on the ways that conceptions of good teaching may vary in different cultures (Radford, 1980). As in the TESL workshop, we wanted participants to know that students and teachers from different cultures and from different subcultures within a larger entity may bring conflicting expectations to the educational enterprise. We also presented some of the studies which have shown that teachers trained in culturally-appropriate instructional methods have often been able to provide more effective initial literacy instruction in reading and writing (Heath, 1983; Jordan, 1983; Cazden, John, and Hymes, 1972). This was used because supervised other teachers and participants could thus benefit from this information. In addition, we noted that no single form of culturally-appropriate behavior would be sufficient for some classrooms serving members of several language minority groups. In such cases, participants were encouraged to develop a variety of approaches and seek assistance from members of the various groups in order to gauge the cultural appropriateness of their teaching and administration.

Following a lunch break, we showed a videotape, "Crosstalk" (British Broadcasting Corporation/Films, Inc., 1979), which illustrates that comparatively small differences in the use of terms, in intonation, and in conversational timing can create major problems of miscommunication even between those who speak the same language (Day 2, Activity 4). We discussed experiences of the participants which were similar to those in the videotape. The scenes from the tape and from participants' own experiences led to a discussion of differences in paralinguistic and sociolinguistic cues (Activity 5). To make the discussion relevant to the professional roles of the participants, we then returned to some of the school incidents used on the first day (Day 1, Activity 3) in discussing the paralinguistic cues which might contribute to misunderstandings between teachers, administrators, students, and parents (Activity 6). The school workshop concluded with discussion of cross-cultural learning activities which the educators might implement in their own schools (Activity 7). Also, workshop leaders had brought a number of books and articles on cross-cultural topics for participants to examine, so some time was allowed for the educators to peruse these materials and select those useful for their own personal study or for the provision of additional in-service training to other teachers at their own sites.

While there were, then, elements common to both of these workshops, the differences are obvious. The TESL workshop, aimed at improving participants' awareness of the cultural aspects of English teaching, used many experiential methods such as role-plays and simulation exercises to meet that goal. The School workshop, planned to introduce educators to several aspects of the relationship between culture and education, depended mainly on cognitive activities such as lectures and discussions to accomplish its goals. Evaluations of each workshop provide an indication of the relative effectiveness of each approach and of the utility of the separate activities conducted.

Evaluation of the Workshops

The evaluation of cross-cultural learning presents a great challenge to all who provide and participate in cross-cultural training. Some of the challenge arises from the nature of the participants and the purpose of the training; Goodwin (1983), for example, notes some of the difficulties in evaluating the cross-cultural learning of ESL students who had received an experimental unit on American culture. As she observes, the learning of cultural material should be evaluated separately from the mastery of the second language even though the pedagogical rationale for presentation of cultural material is, in part, to enhance learning of the language. In the workshops described here, we were not concerned with mastery of a second language; all participants already spoke English fluently, even though many in the TESL workshop were native speakers of other languages. Our concern was to provide cross-cultural training relevant to the professional roles of the trainees who were, in one case, ESL teachers, and in the other, educators in American schools. Hence, in evaluating the workshops, we wished to determine if the training had been perceived as useful by the participants.

This is only one possible aim in the evaluation of training efforts. In an excellent discussion of the many possible goals of cross-cultural training, Grove (1982) employs the concepts of merit and worth, previously developed to describe evaluations of other educational programs, to characterize the outcomes of cross-cultural training efforts. The merit of cross-cultural training can be judged by participants' responses; if they say that the training was well-organized, enjoyable, stimulating, and relevant, then the effort clearly has merit. However, the critical question is whether the effort also has worth which is established by empirical validation in terms of the trainees' increased ability to cope effectively with cultural differences as a result of the training (Grove, 1982: 3-4).

The question of the worth of cross-cultural training could be determined by follow-up study of a trained group, whose professional effectiveness and satisfaction in cross-cultural settings would be compared with an untrained but otherwise similarly qualified group of ESL teachers, educators, or whatever occupation was of interest to the research. Such an undertaking, already carried out for some groups later sent abroad (see Grove 1982: 4), would show whether the training actually helped the teachers and educators to perform better in intercultural settings. This is a central area for future research. Nevertheless, it is still worthwhile to assess the merit of cross-cultural training according to participants' views; doing so can help trainers provide more pertinent and efficient programs for future training efforts and also indicate aspects of the training which participants feel especially are valuable.

TO assess the merit of the two cross-cultural workshops described here, two self-rating scales of cultural knowledge to be used before and after the workshops were developed. Each consisted of ten items which were to be rated on a nine-point scale. Thus the total scale had a maximum of 90 points. The self-rating format was chosen for both practical and theoretical reasons. Practically, it was easy to administer and took little time to complete. Theoretically, it provided a means of linking participants' judgments of their own cultural knowledge and awareness with the specific topics covered in the workshops. The self-rating scale was thus related to a specific area of individual functioning, cross-cultural situations, and hence more meaningful than a general measure of personal sensitivity or awareness according to current theories of social psychology which emphasize the situational boundaries of learning and behavior (Bandura, 1977: 138-140). Some examples of the self-rating items used in the pre-workshop assessment appear in Figure 2. The complete list

of individual items used in each workshop appear in Tables 3 and 4 which will be discussed after overall results have been presented.

Figure 2

Examples of Items from
Self-Rating Scale of Cultural Knowledge

	No Knowledge of this yet			Some Knowledge already			Comprehensive knowledge of area		
Awareness of the nature of value orientations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Awareness of difference between behavior and meaning attached to it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
General awareness of nonverbal behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Understanding of link between cultural values and classroom behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Ability to identify causes of cross-cultural problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Along with the pre- and post- workshop self-ratings, participants were encouraged to offer prose comments to amplify their reactions to the workshops. Seventeen of the 18 persons who completed the TESL workshop and all 14 persons who completed the school workshop did so, thus furnishing another source of evidence regarding participant response to the topics and methods used in the workshops.

Descriptive statistics for the pre- and post- workshop ratings are presented in Table 1 (It should be noted that, in both workshops, the number of those completing the workshop was smaller by 2 people than the number of those present for the first session. Attrition was due principally to conflicting plans made before the workshop dates were announced and thus was not in the main a function of participants' disappointment with the first session.) In addition, the TESL workshop had even more

participants, 29, than the table indicates because several came late and hence could not complete a pre- workshop rating.

insert Table 1 here

As Table 1 shows, the TESL workshop group and the School workshop behaved similarly. Both groups rated themselves above the midpoint (45) on the ninety-point scale even before the workshop. In the case of the TESL group, the high pre- workshop rating probably reflects the extensive study and travel experiences of group members, most of whom had worked or studied abroad before and thus felt knowledgeable about cross-cultural topics. In the case of the School group, the even higher pre- workshop rating is probably due to participants' extensive experience in inter-cultural educational settings in the U.S.; two School participants also noted that they had taken part in similar workshops before. After the workshops, as Table 1 indicates, both groups rated themselves higher and showed less internal variation; the means are higher and the standard deviations lower. This demonstrates that the workshops had indeed provided participants with new information and experiences and also given them a greater common basis for discussion.

To determine whether the gains made by the workshop groups were significant, a t-test was done (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 108-127).[2] Results, displayed in Table 2, show that differences between pre- and post-workshop scores on the total self-rating scale of cultural knowledge were significantly different.

insert Table 2 here

Thus we can justifiably conclude that, overall, the workshops increased the participants' knowledge and awareness of cross-cultural issues.

It is, of course, possible that the participants rated the workshops as effective because they liked the content, the presenters, or the format; their positive feelings might have generalized to the whole experience, creating a halo effect, a problem typical of rating scales (Kerlinger, 1964:516-518). There are two ways to approach this problem: examination of additional evidence and analysis of the individual items contributing to the scale. Both were used in assessing the merit of the workshops.

The main source of additional evidence available was the comments made by participants on the post-workshop rating. The TESL group had been asked to specify whether or not the workshops met their expectations. Of the 18 who completed the two sessions, 14 said 'yes', 3 said 'no', and one answered 'yes and no.' Most respondents said they had mainly learned about the expectations of other cultures and about non-verbal behavior. Asked to name the most useful and interesting activities in the workshop, the TESL group selected the role-plays (12 mentions), communication exercises, and group discussions (both with 8 mentions; multiple selections were allowed). Five participants made illuminating comments about the role-plays. According to one, "Role-plays [were] fun experimental, capture something that discussion and reading cannot capture." Another reported "Watching others role-play was interesting, but the actual role-playing was much more helpful." Two remarked on their reactions to the role-play: "The role-play really made me feel as a foreigner might feel;" "Acting the role of another was difficult and showed how 'foreign' the behavior seemed." An international participant stated that "they [role-plays] are a little bit exaggerated, but show the most striking characteristics." The negative comments also referred to the topics covered. One of those who felt the workshop was unsatisfactory asked for "more applications to teaching .... [more on] the pros and cons of adopting the other

culture's teaching strategy." Another respondent noted that the workshop "didn't meet my expectations but I learned a lot." Both positive and negative comments thus addressed specific aspects of the workshop. The range of reactions and detailed comments suggest that the gains on the rating scale were genuine for this group.

The School group was asked to classify their workshop on a five-point continuum ranging from 'very helpful' to 'not relevant.' Five chose the most positive rating; seven considered the workshop 'generally helpful with some gaps;' two called it 'average'. The most positive notice was given to the films, videotapes, cross-cultural school incidents, and discussions; as one participant said, "people could relate to these personally." Another participant remarked that the films" showed how well-meaning people can misread each other." Less positive comments were made regarding the section on Theory X/Theory Y styles of management ("Too theoretical in only a two-day workshop"). One respondent also noted a need to "deal on the gut level, as opposed to the intellectual level [of the discussions]." Another stated "I have considered and re-considered many many of these topics; for me it was redundant." In this group, too, most of the positive and negative comments were related to the specific activities covered and represented a range of opinion, thus suggesting that the overall gain on the self-rating scale was real not an artifact of over-generalized positive response.

Analysis of the gains on the individual items comprising the self-rating scale of cultural knowledge provides additional information insight into the effectiveness of the workshops. The gains for the ten individual items were assessed through a series of t-tests. Results appear in Tables 3 and 4. Results show that participants demonstrated significant gains after the workshop on some of the items but on no others.

insert Tables 3 and 4 here

It is apparent that the scales are not identical. While they contained seven common items dealing with general topics such as non-verbal behavior and cultural values, each scale had been developed with the particular goals in mind. Hence three items were specific to each workshop.

Examining the pre- and post- workshop self-ratings from the TESL group (Table 3), we find that participants made significant gains on eight of the ten items included. The greatest gain was made on the em related to the knowledge of workshop training format. Because many of the international participants had not taken part in a workshop before, this result is not surprising. For this group of language teachers, the strongest pattern of

gain emerged from the items dealing with potential classroom applications of material presented in the workshop. As Table 3 shows, participants made significant gains on each of the three items treating classroom applications. In addition they rated themselves significantly higher on three items in the general areas of values and non-verbal behavior. For two other items in these categories, the participants showed a trend towards gain but the pre- and post- workshop ratings were not significantly different. (This result may in part have arisen because the pre- workshop rating on both items was already above the 5 point mark on the scale. Because the participants knew more about these topics initially, they may have paid less attention to them in the workshop and concentrated on the new information regarding aspects of language teaching.) In sum, then, the pre- and post- workshop ratings show that participants' gains were due to the aspects of the workshop that were new for them-- the workshop format-- and to those which dealt specifically with cultural factors affecting the second language classroom. While other general items also showed gains, some significant and some non-significant, the increase was not as marked. It should also be noted that the classroom application items on the rating scale reflected the positive response to one of the most effective activities, the cross-cultural classroom role-play. For the TESL Workshop, comparisons of participant ratings before and after the workshop thus confirm the merit of the training, particularly as it was related to the professional needs of those trained, English as a second language instructors.

Participant gains on the self-ratings for the School Workshop, shown in Table 4, also demonstrate patterns of gain related to the activities used during the workshop. Many of the presentations, including the films and videotapes, had emphasized aspects of non-verbal behavior and value

orientations; three items in these categories showed significant gains. There is a trend towards gain on two of the five items related to school applications; for two of the five items, differences between pre- and post-workshop ratings are significant. This pattern of gain again reflects the activities the participants saw as useful. In their comments, they had mentioned the films, videotapes, and discussions of actual school-related incidents as the most helpful parts of the workshop; their ratings bear this out. For this group, the pre- workshop ratings were already relatively high, with all but one item rated above 5 and four pre- workshop items rated above 6. Hence the modest gains related to the school applications are to be expected. These participants were experienced professionals at the outset of the workshop. They already know a great deal about their own culture and the cultures of the students with whom them worked. Nevertheless, the workshop proved useful in raising awareness of some aspects of values, orientations, and non-verbal behavior and, to a slightly lesser extent, in helping these educators apply this awareness to school settings.

It is interesting to compare the results of the individual item ratings for the two workshops (Tables 3 and 4). Both groups found some of the general material on values and non-verbal behavior helpful, as demonstrated by the differences between pre- and post- workshop ratings. The TESL group found the parts of the workshop involving direct simulation of a second-language classroom very helpful, as shown by their gains on all three related items. Participants in the School Workshop also made some significant gains but these were not as strong as in the TESL workshop.

The approach used in covering the application portion of the workshop may have been partly responsible for this difference. In studies of attitude change, it has been found that affective treatments are superior to cognitive training alone (Furuto and Furuto, 1983). In teacher education,

it has also been noted that training programs which include coaching, or practice of a specified behavior under the guidance of an expert, are superior to those based on cognitive or lecture presentations alone (Joyce and Clift, 1984). The TESL Workshop had included both affective experience and coaching in the role-play, which was carried out under the direction of "experts"-natives of the culture being simulated. Furthermore, the role-play and the participant exercises, both involving affective as well as cognitive learning, were clearly among the most popular activities in the TESL workshop. The School group had engaged in fewer experiential activities; the gains shown on their rating scale were most closely related to the media presentations and discussions, both cognitive activities, that they had received. Participant comments mirrored the difference, and some participants had called for more activities "on the gut level" as a part of their workshop. In describing a teacher training program for bilingual teachers, Clark and Milk (1983) include opportunites for students to experience several local cultures by participating in local events and celebrations. It would be useful to build such participation into another workshop like the one described here in order to involve educators on the affective as well as the cognitive level.

Conclusion

Many questions related to cross-cultural training for ESL teachers and educational administrators remain unanswered. One of the major questions to be investigated is that of the worth of such training-- its value in changing the long-term effectiveness of participants in future cross-cultural settings. One method of assessing long-term effectiveness has been presented by Constantinides (1984), who reports using a self-addressed letter each participant would write for personal use and reflection. The letter, mailed six months after conclusion of the workshop, served to show

participants if they had managed to effect change in their cross-cultural dealings. Other possible methods of determining the worth of cross-cultural training include actual observations of participants or rating scales to be completed by the students or supervisors of those trained. Such methods would help to establish whether or not cross-cultural training improves adaptive behavior in professional settings, an issue Grove (1982) rightly highlights as critical.

Yet long-term changes ought not to be the only standard by which the effectiveness of cross-cultural training is judged. Simply exploring aspects of different cultural values, non-verbal behavior, and school-related expectations is useful in its own right for language teachers and educators who work in cross-cultural settings. Activities that accomplish this are thus valuable regardless of long-term consequences. The workshops described here included many such activities; those interested in setting up their own corss-cultural training workshops may wish to experiment with some of them. Cognitive and experiential approaches both offer different possibilities and have proven successful, although in these workshops the experiential activities produced the most positive results. In the words of one participant, "with something like culture, experience is the best way to appreciate the complexity, subtlety, and force of cultural values on behavior."

Table 1

Number of respondents, means, and standard deviations

for Self-Rating Scale of Cultural Knowledge

(90 point scale)

	Pre-workshop			Post-workshop		
	n	$\bar{x}$	(sd)	n	$\bar{x}$	(sd)
TESL Workshop	20	47.0	(15.2)	18	67.7	(10.2)
School Workshop	16	56.1	(19.2)	14	69.5	(10.4)

Table 2

Pre- and Post-Workshop Comparison,

Self-Rating Scale of Cultural Knowledge

	Pre-workshop		Post-workshop		Difference	t-ratio
	$\bar{x}$	(sd)	$\bar{x}$	(sd)		
TESL Workshop	47.0	(15.2)	67.7	(10.2)	20.7	4.97***
School Workshop	56.1	(19.2)	69.5	(10.4)	13.4	2.42*

*** $p < .001$

* $p < .025$

Table 3

Pre- and Post-Workshop Comparison of
Individual Items, Self-Rating Scale of Cultural Knowledge,
TESL Workshop (9 point scale)

Individual Items on Self-Rating Scale	Pre-workshop Rating n	$\bar{x}$	(sd)	Post-workshop Rating n	$\bar{x}$	(sd)	Difference	t-ratio
Topic: Values								
Awareness of values within own culture	20	5.9	(2.6)	18	7.1	(1.5)	+ 1.2	1.775
Awareness of nature of value orientations	19	4.3	(2.3)	18	6.3	(1.5)	+ 2.0	3.159**
Topic: Non-Verbal Communication								
Awareness of difference between behavior and meaning attached to it	19	5.2	(2.3)	18	6.5	(1.5)	+ 1.3	2.031
Knowledge of range of non-verbal behavior in own culture	20	5.4	(2.4)	18	6.8	(1.8)	+ 1.4	2.065*
General awareness of non-verbal behavior	19	5.5	(1.9)	18	7.2	(1.4)	+ 1.7	2.906**
Topic: Classroom Applications								
Knowledge of rationale for adapting classroom behavior to different settings	20	4.1	(1.9)	18	6.2	(1.4)	+ 2.1	3.990**
Awareness of non-verbal behavior in classrooms	20	5.1	(2.8)	18	7.0	(1.4)	+ 1.9	2.687*
Understanding of connection between societal values and classroom behavior	20	4.7	(1.8)	18	6.8	(1.3)	+ 2.1	4.697***
Topic: Workshop Format								
Knowledge of Workshop Training Format	20	3.4	(2.4)	18	6.9	(1.4)	+ 3.5	5.654***
Enjoyment of Workshop Traing format	20	5.0	(2.1)	18	6.9	(1.5)	+ 1.9	3.177**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 4

Pre- and Post-Workshop Comparison of
Individual Items, Self-Rating Scale of Cultural Knowledge,
School Workshop (9 point scale)

Individual Items on Self-Rating Scale	Pre-workshop Rating n	$\bar{x}$	(sd)	Post-workshop Rating n	$\bar{x}$	(sd)	Difference	t-ratio
Topic: Values								
Awareness of values within own culture	16	7.3	(1.3)	14	7.3	(1.1)	____	.066
Awareness of nature of value orientations	16	4.9	(1.9)	14	6.8	(1.4)	+ 1.9	3.220**
Topic: Non-Verbal Communication								
Awareness of difference between behavior and meanind attached to it	16	5.3	(1.7)	14	6.8	(1.4)	+ 1.5	2.048*
Knowledge of range of non-verbal behavior in own culture	16	6.5	(2.1)	14	6.9	(1.1)	+ .4	.728
General awareness of non-verbal behavior	16	5.6	(1.9)	14	7.3	(1.3)	+ 1.7	2.880**
Topic: School Applications								
Ability to deal with students and parents from other cultures	16	6.6	(1.3)	14	7.0	(1.1)	+ .4	1.188
Knowledge of local cultural stereotypes	15	6.6	(1.4)	14	7.0	(1.2)	+ .4	.950
Understanding of connection between societal values and classroom behavior	16	5.8	(2.1)	14	6.8	(1.2)	+ 1.0	1.639
Awareness of non-verbal behavior in classroom settings	16	5.9	(2.0)	14	7.0	(1.3)	+ 1.1	1.833*
Ability to identify causes of cross-cultural problems	16	5.5	(1.9)	14	6.6	(1.3)	+ 1.1	1.864*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Notes

1. Several persons have contributed materially to the work described here. Jose Galvan, Kathy Kelly, and Carol Saltzman provided valuable guidance and assistance in planning and carrying out the workshops; Barbara Clark and Alice Petrossian offered extensive comments used in developing the cross-cultural incidents for the school workshop; Craig Chaudron and John Oller gave helpful advice on the analysis used (although neither would necessarily agree with the procedures I finally chose). To all, my thanks.
2. A more desirable approach to the analysis would have been the matched pair t-test (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 114-119) which uses the difference between each individual's pre- and post- treatment score as the basis for analysis. However, the workshop self-ratings were kept anonymous in order to encourage extensive prose comments and it was thus not possible to match an individual's pre-workshop rating with that same individual's post-workshop score. Hence the whole group means for pre- and post- workshop ratings were used for analysis in a standard t-test. Because the difference between the two types of t-tests is "more conceptual than computational" (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 115), the use of a standard t-test did not distort the results.

References

Albert, Rosita Daska, and Harry C. Triandis. 1979. Cross-cultural training: a theoretical framework and some observations. In Bilingual multicultural education and the professional, Henry T. Trueba and Carol Barnett-Mizrahi (Eds.), 181-194. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Batchelder, Donald, and Elizabeth G. Warner. 1977. Beyond experience. Brattleboro, Vermont: The Experiment Press.

Bandura, Albert. 1977, Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Batchelder, Donald...

Black, Alan J. 1978 A rationale for including a course in culture in an ESL teacher-training program. Unpublished MA thesis in TESL, University of California, Los Angeles.

Brislin, Richard W. 1979. Orientation programs for cross-cultural preparation. In Perspectives on cross-cultural psychology, Anthony J. Marsella, Roland G. Tharp, and Thomas J. Ciborowski (Eds.), 287-305. New York: Academic Press.

Cazden, Courtney B., Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes, (Eds). 1972. Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, Ellen R., and Robert D. Milk. 1983. Training bilingual teachers: a look at the Title VII graduate in the field. NABE Journal 8(1): 41-53.

Condon, John C., and Fathi S. Yonsef. 1975. An introduction to intercultural communication. Indianapolis Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing.

Constantinides, Janet C. 1984. Cross-cultural awareness workshops for faculty and staff. Presentation at the 18th Annual TESOL Convention; Houston, Texas, March 5-10, 1984.

Crawford-Lange, Linda M., and Dale L. Lange. 1984. Doing the unthinkable in the second-language classroom: a process for the integration of language and culture. In Teaching for proficiency, the organizing principle, Theodore V. Higgs (Ed.), 139-177. Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Textbook Company.

Cumming, Alister. 1984. Workshop, orientation, simulation. TESL Talk 15(1 and 2): 29-35.

Donahue, Meghan, and Adelaide Heyde Parsons. 1982. The use of role-play to overcome cultural fatigue. TESOL Quarterly 16(3): 359-365.

Dunnett, Stephen C., with Fraida Dubin and Amy Lezberg. 1981. English language teaching from an intercultural perspective. In Learning across cultures, Gary Althen (Ed.), 51-71. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

insert → Ekman, Paul ...

English, Susan Lewis. 1981. Critical incidents workshop for ESL teacher intercultural awareness training. In On TESOL '80, Janet Cameron Fisher, Mark A. Clarke, and Jacquelyn Schacter, (Eds.), 159-170.

Furuto, Sharlene B.C.L., and David M. Furuto. 1983. The effects of affective and cognitive treatment on attitude change toward ethnic minority groups. International Journal of Intercultural Relations 7(2): 149-165.

Ekman, Paul, and W.V. Friesen. 1969. The repertoire of nonverbal behavior. Semiotica I (I): 49-98.

Goodwin, Janet m. 1983. Creating cultural awareness in university ESL students. Unpublished MA thesis in TESL, University of California, Los Angeles.

Grove, Cornelius Lee. 1982. Improving intercultural learning through the orientation of sojourners. AFS Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning, Nunmber 1. New York: AFS International.

Hatch, Evelyn, and Hossein Farhady. 1982. Research design and statistics for applied linguistics. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

insert → Heath, Shirley Brice ...

Heath, Shirley Brice. 1983. Ways with words. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hernandez, Hilda. 1984. Transcultural sensitization: try it. You'll like it! Paper presented at the 18th Annual TESOL Convention, Houston, Texas, March 5-10, 1984.

insert ← Hoopes, David ...

Hoopes, David S., and Paul Ventura, (Eds.). 1979. Intercultural Sourcebook: cross-cultural training methodologies. Chicago: Intercultural Press.

Jordan, Cathie. 1983. Cultural differences in communication patterns: classroom adaptations and translation strategies. In On TESOL '82, Mark A. Clarke and Jean Handscombe (Eds.), 285-294. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Joyce, Bruce, and Renee Clift. 1984. The phoenix agenda: essential reform in teacher education. Educational research 13(4): 5-18.

Kerlinger, Fred N. 1964. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Klassen, Bernard R. 1981. Communicative competence and second language learning. In Research in the language arts, Victor Froese and Stanley Straw (Eds.), 27-40. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Koontz, Harold, and Cyril O'Donnell. 1978. Essentials of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Levine, Deena, and Mara B. Adelman. 1982. Beyond language. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

McGregor, Douglas. 1960. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McGroarty, Mary, and Jose Galvan. In press. Culture as an issue for language teachers. In Essays for teachers of English as a second or foreign language, Marianne Celce-Murcia (Ed.). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Muyskens, Judith A. 1984. Preservice and inservice training: focus on proficiency. In Teaching for proficiency, the organizing principle, Theodore V. Higgs (Ed.). 179-200. Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Textbook Company.

Nicholson, Alexander M., Bruce R. Joyce, Donald W. Parker, and Floyd T. Waterman. 1976. The literature on inservice teacher education: an analytic review. Report III of Inservice Teacher Education Project. Palo Alto, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

Piper, David, and Terry Piper. 1983. Reality and second-language role play. The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des langues vivantes 40(1): 82-87.

Preston, Dennis R. 1981. The ethnography of TESOL. TESOL Quarterly 15 (2): 105-116.

Radford, A.E. 1980. Outstanding teacher characteristics as perceived by Saudi Arabian ESL students and American college students. Unpublished M.A. thesis in TESL, University of California, Los Angeles.

Robinson, Gail L. N. 1981. Issues in second language and cross-cultural education: the forest through the trees. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Robinson, Gail L.N. 1978. The magic-carpet-ride-to- another-culture syndrome: an international perspective. Foreign Language Annals 11(2): 135-146.

Rosenfeld, Howard M. 1982. Measurement of body motion and orientation. In Handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research, Klaus R. Scherer and Paul Ekman (Eds.), 199-286. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sadow, Stephen A., and Monica A. Maxwell. 1983. The foreign teaching assistant and the culture of the American university class. In On TESOL '82, Mark A. Clarke and Jean Handscombe (Eds.), 253-258. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

APPENDIX

Examples of the Cross-cultural Incidents Written for the School Workshop

In total, ten incidents were written based on actual experiences that had occurred in the school districts where the workshop took place. All followed the format of the examples shown here.

'All Work and No Play'; the Students Who Won't Participate

Several of the teachers who work with a group of ESL students at Washington High are concerned. The students are all willing workers in class, but they don't seem to have much interest in participating in after-school activities. They don't join clubs; they don't do volunteer work; they often don't come to the school dances. The teachers feel the students are missing a vital part of the high school experience.

What's going on here? What would you tell the teachers?

The 'Big Boys' Who Can't Throw a Football

Mr. Heath, the assistant varsity coach and history teacher, is disturbed. Three very good prospects for the team -- all big fellows six feet or over with good solid builds -- don't seem to be interested in trying out for football. These students, two Hispanics and one Korean, know something about the sport, Mr. Heath thinks; he has heard them talking about the score of a game with another high school. He has seen them kicking a soccer ball around, and remembers that at a picnic last year they were all throwing a frisbee, though rather awkwardly. He just can't see why these students don't try out for the school football team and give his defensive line the strength it needs.

What's going on here? What would you tell Mr. Heath?

The Parent Who Says 'Yes'

Li Nguyen, a tenth-grade Vietnamese girl, is persistently absent. She is a good and diligent student who is attentive when she is in school, but her repeated absences have become cause for concern. When the counselor arranged a conferences for her and her mother, it was discovered that Li misses school often because her mother is sometimes called to work on short notice and Li takes care of three younger siblings and two younger cousins. The counselor and the principal talk with Mrs. Nguyen, Li's mother, about the importance of consistent attendance; Mrs. Nguyen nods and murmurs 'yes' to everything they say. Yet Li is absent three out of the next five days.

What's going on here? How can the counselor and the principal be sure Mrs. Nguyen understands what they are saying?

Films and Videotapes Used

"Crosstalk." 1979. Produced by John Twitchin for the British Broadcasting Corporation. Distributed in the U.S. by Firms, Inc., Wilmette, Illinois.

"Los Vendidos." Aired on December 10, 1972. Produced by El Teatro Campesino for KNBC-TV, Los Angeles. Distributed by Pixan Film Center, El Centro Campesino Cultural, San Juan Bautista, California.

"Manwatcher." 1980. Produced by Desmond Morris for the British Broadcasting-Corporation. Distributed in the U.S. by Films, Inc., Wilmette, Illinois.

"Perception." 1979. Produced by McGraw-Hill. Distributed by CRM/McGraw-Hill Films, Inc., Del Mar, California.